

REMARKS**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, new claim 23 has been added. Reconsideration of the allowability of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW BEFORE OFFICE ACTION

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the below signed representative of applicants to discuss the pending claims before issuance of a first Office Action.

Applicants believe that a more thorough review of the underlying references and the pending claims will be helpful to further prosecution.

COMMENTS IN ADVISORY ACTION AND OUTSTANDING REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 3, 6-12, 15-17, 21-22 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Lipton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,991,398; claims 2, 4-5, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lipton et al., in view of Bergen et al., U.S. Patent No. 4,536,621; and claims 13-14 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious over Lipton et al., in view of Parks et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,977,746. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

In the Advisory Action issued June 14, 2006, the Examiner indicated that Lipton et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,991,398, disclosed that the same conversation would be presented in the handset as in the speaker, relying on col. 3, lines 43-52, of Lipton et al.

Here, similar to applicants previous arguments, the Examiner has interpreted the pending claims to require that the claimed conversation signal transmitted through the speaker, in the one-way speakerphone operation of the speaker, is the same coincident conversation as the claimed conversation presented in the two-way communication operation of the handset.

However, the Office Action has further set forth that such a coincident transmission is disclosed by Lipton et al.

The Advisory Action stated the conversations in the handset and the speaker were the same based upon the statement in Lipton et al., that "[t]he second speakerphone mode is initiated in response to removing the handset (32) from the handset receiving portion (60)(

which, in turn, releases the hook switch 54)." In particular, the Advisory Action states that, based on this discussion in Lipton et al., "[c]learly, the speaker and the handset are operating simultaneously to conduct conversation."

However, Lipton et al. does not say that both the handset and the speaker are performing the same conversation simultaneously.

Thus, it is believed that there may be a misunderstanding regarding the disclosure of Lipton et al.

As previously noted, the primary aspect of the invention of Lipton et al. would appear to be focused on permitting two different conversations to coexist, i.e., the conversation of the handset is not the same conversation as the speakerphone.

This is fundamentally different from the presently claimed invention.

As the two conversations are different there is no correlation between a completion of the dialing and the connecting of the speaker. In Lipton et al., if dialing is performed while using the handset then the dialing will be heard in the handset. If dialing is performed for the speakerphone, then the dial tone and dialing will be heard in the speaker.

There is no support in Lipton et al. that the opening of any one-way communication of the speaker is performed upon completion of the dialing. Applicants respectfully reference the previous response, which discusses the disclosure of Lipton et al. in greater detail, the arguments therein being incorporated herein by reference.

Accordingly, with this proper understanding of Lipton et al., it is respectfully submitted that Lipton et al. fails to disclose at least the independent claims 1, 3, 6, 17, 21, 22, and 23. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 2, 4-5, and 18-20 are patentably distinguishable over any combination of Lipton et al., Bergen et al. and Parks et al., at least for the aforementioned and previous arguments presented in the previous response.

Withdrawal of all rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/644,931


Docket No.: 1349.1271

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/14/06

By: 
Stephen T. Boughner
Registration No. 45,317

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501